

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, and 21-32 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. In the Final Office Action dated December 27, 2008, claim 9 was allowed, claims 1-6, 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 21-28, 30, and 31 were rejected, and claims 29 and 32 were objected to. In the present response, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 29, 30, and 32, and cancel claims 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 19, 21, and 25-28.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

### **I. Claim Objections**

Claims 6, 18 and 19 were objected to because of a number of informalities. These claims have been canceled, rendering the objections moot.

### **II. Rejection of claims 1-5, 14, 18, 19, 22-28, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-5, 14, 18, 19, 22-28, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Claims 2, 14, 18, 19, and 25-28 have been canceled, rendering the rejection moot. Regarding claims 22-24, it is not clear exactly why these claims are being rejected, because the Final Office Action is silent with respect to a specific reason for the rejection. Applicants request that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' representative for an Examiner's Amendment if claims 22-24 are somehow deficient.

In claim 1, in lines 10-11, it was alleged that "the at least one router" lacks antecedent basis. Applicants have removed this language from the claim, rendering the rejection moot.

In claim 5, in line 5, it was alleged that a --,-- should be inserted between "packet" and "the first". Applicants have removed this language from the claim, rendering the rejection moot. Also in claim 5, lines 9-10, it was alleged that the wording "...further comprising changing of addressing the compressed packet..." was confusing. Applicants have amended this claim language to the following:

“...wherein the source of the compressed packet is altered to identify comprises identifies the first termination node and the destination of the compressed packet is altered to identify identifies a BSC IP address.”

Applicants believe that the rejection has been overcome by this amendment.

Regarding claim 30, it was alleged that it is unclear whether or not the steps in lines 7-17 are performed if the anchor BSC receives “the at least one unicast packet”, since the steps in lines 7-17 refer to “the multicast compressed frame packet”. Applicants believe that the claim language is clear on its face. The apparatus/steps recited in lines 7-17 specifically refer to the multicast compressed frame packet and/or the duplicate multicast compressed frame packet. There is no ambiguity in this language that would lead one to believe that a unicast packet is being managed. Applicants do not believe there is a requirement to provide further information pertaining to the receipt of a unicast packet by a BSC. The claim simply recites that the BSC receives at least one unicast packet in addition to multicast compressed frame packets, and the processing of multicast compressed frame packets.

Claim 30 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 because it is allegedly unclear whether or not “an anchor BSC” in line 6 is the same as “a base station” in claim 10, line 15, since they both receive the unicast packet. Applicants have amended claim 30 to clarify that the anchor BSC is the same as the base station in claim 30, but having additional operating characteristics. Applicants believe that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 should, therefore, be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 6, 14, 18, and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 6, 14, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Eyuboglu et al. US 6,781,999 in view of Sato et al. US 6,895,216. Applicants have cancelled these claims, rendering the rejection moot.

### **IV. Rejection of Claims 10, 12, and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Eyuboglu et al. US 6,781,999 in view of Lim US 6,801,508 and further in view of Sato, et al. US 6,895,216.

Claims 10 and 21 have been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot. Claim 12 now depends on claim 29, which was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 29 has been rewritten in independent form, incorporating base claim 10. Therefore, Applicants believe that claim 12 is now allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim, namely claim 29.

**V. Allowable Claims**

In the Final Office Action, claim 9 was allowed and claims 29 and 32 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 29 and 32 have been rewritten in independent form, incorporating base claim 10 for each of claims 29 and 32. In addition, Applicants have amended method claim 1 to conform to allowed means-plus-function claim 9. Therefore, Applicants believe claim 1, as well as claims 3-5 that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2008

By: /Kam T. Tam/  
Kam T. Tam, Reg. No. 35,756  
(858) 651-5563

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502